

REMARKS

In this application, claims 20, 26 through 32, and 37 through 48 are pending. No claims currently stand allowed. In response to the first Office Action, dated December 16, 2002, applicants submitted their Amendment A, in which then-pending independent claims 1, 33, 34, 35, and 36 were amended. The final Office Action, dated June 3, 2003, rejected claims 1 through 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,887,139 to Madison et al. (*Madison*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,944 to Lipkin (*Lipkin*). This CPA Preliminary Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action.

Each of the independent claims in this application makes reference to external resource markup language files. In the final Office Action it is argued that *Madison* discloses the non-compiled nature of such resource files. It is, indeed, well-known to those having skill in the art that a file that is formatted in accordance with a markup language is not compiled down to machine code and thus is not "compiled" in the conventional sense. On the other hand, it is also well-known to those having skill in the art that a markup language file is scanned and parsed, and a parse tree or similar data structure is produced, in a manner that is entirely like the partial compilation of a program source file by the front end of a compiler.

The novelty of applicants' claims does not rest on whether the resource file is characterized as compilable or non-compilable. Because the final Office Action expressly maintains the rejections of the claims in their form prior to this CPA Amendment (*Madison* in view of *Lipkin*), applicants hereinafter explain why the pending claims are patentable over these references.

The invention disclosed in *Madison* is directed to a client-server system for providing "a configurable graphical user interface useful in managing network devices connected to a

network" (*Madison*, col. 1, ll. 7-9). *Madison* does not teach or suggest a "computer software application development system" as recited in independent claim 20. Improvements in the management of network devices have no obvious connection to the claimed methods and systems for developing computer software. Moreover, applicants' claims do not recite a client-server system architecture as claim elements.

As currently amended, claim 20 recites "*a first group of system users responsible for writing computer software code*" and "*a second group of system users responsible for modifying one or more external resource files written in a markup language*." As such, claim 20 describes a system in which the external resource files facilitate a division of labor in software development, which is not described or referred to in *Madison*, including the parts of *Madison* specifically cited in the discussion of original claim 20 on page 7 of the first Office Action.

Independent claim 28 is a "*method for enhancing security in a computer software application development environment*," and independent claim 37 is a computer-readable medium counterpart to claim 28. In the first Office Action it was asserted that *Lipkin* disclosed the security-enhancing aspect of claim 28, and that *Madison* taught the elements of the body of the claim. As support for the view that *Lipkin* disclosed a method for enhancing security in an application developing environment, the Office action specifically cited column 18, lines 58-67 of *Lipkin* (First Office Action, p. 10).

Like *Madison*, *Lipkin* is concerned with subject matter that is unrelated to applicants' claims. *Lipkin* relates to "storing, dynamically reconstructing, and navigating a three-dimensional virtual world using a database system" (*Lipkin*, col. 1, ll. 5-8). The portion of *Lipkin* cited in the first Office action in the rejection of the previous version of claim 28 describes an embodiment of the *Lipkin* invention in which passwords are used to restrict access to a virtual

worlds processing database. It manifestly has nothing to do with enhancing security in a software application development environment. The cited passage states:

Preferably, the administration pages 32 include a configuration mechanism whereby a system administrator can define the name of a database accessible to the VRML Agent and manager application. In step 302, a manager application presents a login dialog to the user that prompts the user to enter a user name, password, and database name. The user enters the requested information. If it matches the information provided by the system administrator in the configuration step, and the user name and password are recognized by the named database server, then a connection is established to the named database.

Lipkin, col. 18, ll. 58-67. In a software development setting, security relates to access to different types of source materials for a software product, such as application source code files, executable binary files, and resource files.

The elements of the bodies of claims 28 and 37 are not taught or suggested by *Madison*. These claims include "*providing a first user with authority to modify the one or more resource files and execute an application program associated with the one or more resource files*" and "*restricting the first user from accessing and modifying source code for the application program*." *Madison*, which is not directed to software application development at all, does not disclose or suggest a method involving such steps.

Amended independent claims 20, 28, and 37 are patentable over the references cited in the first and final Office actions for the reasons discussed above. Amended dependent claims 26, 27, and 29-32, and new dependent claims 38-48 depend from the independent claims. These dependent claims are patentable as they include all the limitations of the patentable independent claims.

CONCLUSION

The application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard E. Fontana
Richard E. Fontana, Reg. No. 52,902
One of the Attorneys for Applicants
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

November 26, 2003